For the Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST LITIGATION | No. M 07-1827 SI MDL. No. 1827 |
|--|--|
| This Order Relates to: | ORDER GRANTING UNITED STATES' MOTION TO MODIFY THE COURT'S |
| ALL CASES | SEPTEMBER 25, 2007 ORDER |
| / | |

On June 19, 2009, the Court heard argument on the United States' motion to modify the Court's September 25, 2007 Order Granting United States' Motion to Stay Discovery. (Docket No. 990). The September 25, 2007 order permits the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division to review all discovery in this matter. DOJ seeks to modify the order to permit DOJ receive copies of all discovery in this matter, including deposition transcripts.

The motion is unopposed by plaintiffs and all defendants except the AUO and Toshiba defendants. The Court does not find appropriate AUO's proposal to allow questioning of deponents regarding the grand jury proceedings or the witnesses' testimony. As the government notes, witnesses may voluntarily disclose information about the grand jury proceedings and their testimony, and the current limitations only prohibit attorneys from compelling testimony in a deposition.

The Court is also not persuaded by the objections raised by Toshiba, and finds that the DOJ should be permitted to receive copies of the documents and transcripts in these proceedings. Cf. In re Grand Jury Subpoena Served on Meserve, Mumper & Hughes, 62 F.3d 1222, 1224-26 (9th Cir. 1995). The DOJ does not seek to compel foreign discovery that would otherwise be outside the grand jury's subpoena power, but instead seeks copies of evidence brought into the United States as part of discovery

Case 3:06-cv-07588-SI Document 129 Filed 06/24/09 Page 2 of 2

For the Northern District of California

United States District Court

in this case. As discussed at the June 19, 2009 hearing, it may be appropriate to explore modifications to the discovery schedule and plan, and if the Toshiba defendants (or any other parties) wish to do so, they should meet and confer and discuss the matter with Judge Smith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 24, 2009

United States District Judge